

**Remarks**

The Office Action mailed May 17, 2005 has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment has been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 1, 5, and 8-19 are now pending in this application. Claims 1 and 5 are amended. Claim 2 is newly cancelled. Claims 1, 2, 5, and 8-19 stand rejected.

The rejection of Claims 1-2, 5, and 8-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Jiang (US 6,278,913 B1) in view of Dahlberg (US 6,463,439 B1) is respectfully traversed.

This rejection no longer applies to Claim 2, which has been cancelled.

With respect to the remaining claims, even assuming, *arguendo*, that all of the Office's assertions are correct regarding Jiang and Dahlberg are correct, neither teaches nor suggests anything regarding extracting re-alerted and/or backdated data from a program database. More particularly, Jiang is concerned with sampling and filtering, decoding, encrypting and compressing data and placing it onto a smart card (see Fig. 7). Although a filtering process can be used to reduce noise, remove artifacts, etc. (Fig. 8(b)), this corresponds only to the filtering process of placing data to the smart card, col. 8, lines 33-45 and col. 9, lines 18-35. Also, there is no teaching or suggestion of backdating or re-alerting data in the discussion of downloading and analyzing data at col. 15, line 11 to col. 16, line 43 or at col. 5, line 47 to col. 6, line 13.

Furthermore, Dahlberg, at most, teaches at col. 5, lines 47-55 that information that has been changed since the last full extraction is extracted because incremental extraction takes less time. Nowhere does Dahlberg teach or suggest anything regarding extracting re-alerted and/or backdated data from a program database.

By contrast, Applicants' Claim 1 as herein amended recites, "... extracting data from said program database, wherein said data comprises engine configuration data, aircraft configuration data, engine input data, engine raw output data, engine smoothed output data, aircraft input data, aircraft raw output data, aircraft smoothed output data, alert data, initialization data and compressed data, and wherein said extracted data includes re-alerted and backdated data ... ". See the Application as originally filed at page 3, line 25 to page 4,

line 3; and particularly, page 8, lines 3-13. Claim 5 has been amended to contain a similar feature. No such feature is taught or suggested by Jiang or Dahlberg, or by their combination. Therefore, is submitted that Claims 1 and 5 are patentable over Jiang in view of Dahlberg.

Claims 8-19 depend directly or indirectly from independent Claim 5. When the recitations of Claims 8-19 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 5, Applicants submit that Claims 8-19 are likewise patentable over Jiang in view of Dahlberg.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103 rejection of Claims 1-2, 5, and 8-19 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,



Alan L. Cassel  
Registration No. 35,842  
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP  
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600  
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740  
(314) 621-5070